

1964

COMMEMORATING THE 46TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. BROTZMAN (at the request of Mr. BALDWIN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, 46 years ago on February 16 Lithuania was proclaimed an independent country after 123 years of Russian rule. This brave nation enjoyed freedom for only 22 short years until the Russians again marched in to deprive the Lithuanian people of their hard-fought freedoms.

During those 22 joyous years of independence between World War I and World War II, the proud and industrious people of Lithuania demonstrated to the world what freedom can achieve. Free from foreign domination the Lithuanian people made unprecedented advances in transportation, education, land reform, and social legislation. Today after 24 years of Soviet domination much of this has been destroyed and replaced by such Soviet practices as mass murder, deportation, and religious suppression. Let us today join our Lithuanian friends in a reaffirmation of the persevering hope that Lithuania will soon be free. We look forward hopefully to the day when we can celebrate their second liberation from Russian misrule.

SERVING NO NATIONAL SECURITY PURPOSE, RESIDUAL OIL CONTROLS REMAIN A COSTLY, UNWARRANTED BURDEN

(Mr. KEITH (at the request of Mr. BALDWIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, in response to a petition I had the privilege of helping originate early in 1961, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning recommended a "meaningful relaxation" of residual oil controls. A full year has passed and we are still waiting.

New England, New York, and Florida—the entire east coast of the United States for that matter—still suffer the burden of an unwarranted and ill-advised system of Government controls. The OEP recommendation could have and should have been placed into immediate effect by a stroke of the President's pen. These stifling restrictions remain despite the OEP report and despite even the fact that they are of no real value to those competing industries who most strongly support the quota program. On this score I would like to quote the distinguished Washington writer, Mr. Clyde LaMotte, who wrote in the February 3, 1964, issue of the Oil and Gas Journal:

No one really wants residual controls very much, except maybe the coal people. And they would be hard put to prove that the resid program has enabled them to sell an extra scuttle of coal.

Mr. Speaker, if on one wants the program and if the program serves no significant purpose insofar as national security

in concerned, and if this administration truly wishes to reduce unnecessary costs and needless spending in the name of national defense, why then is a very substantial segment of this Nation's economy forced to bear the inequities and hardships it has undeniably created?

I have tried to be open minded in this, but I have been unable to find a reasonable answer to this troubling question. Let us look at the facts. On this first-year anniversary, let us look again at the OEP report:

When the overall oil import control program was established in 1959, President Eisenhower stated that its basis was the certified requirements of our national security, which make it necessary that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States.

The President's statement, made on March 10, 1959, also noted:

The Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization will keep the entire program under constant surveillance and will inform the President of any circumstances which in his opinion indicate the need for any further Presidential action.

The need for this action was apparent and was brought to the attention of the subsequent administration 1 year ago; but these recommendations have been largely ignored. The insignificant increases in the quotas granted by the Interior Department have scarcely kept up with the normal growth of demand. By no stretch of the imagination could these small increments be considered "meaningful," either in the spirit of the OEP report's recommendations or in the effect they have had on the residual oil market on the east coast. This has been a mere drop in the bucket. Our public institutions, our industry, our utility users and consumers still pay a wasteful, needless, surcharge for this important fuel.

Let it be clearly understood that throughout President Eisenhower's original proclamation, and in all subsequent amendments, residual fuel oil is treated separately from crude oil and other petroleum products. This is significant in view of the current attempts to tie the two together by the Secretary of Interior and those interests which oppose removal of residual import controls.

As I have noted, in early 1961 we petitioned for a study of the control program. I was joined in this effort by my colleagues in the New England and Florida congressional delegations, the New England council and various representatives of industry. The OCDM, now OEP, undertook an exhaustive, detailed study of the question. Frank B. Ellis, then Director of OCDM, clearly spelled out the study's purpose in a statement on May 22, 1961:

To determine the effect from the standpoint of the national security of imports of residual fuel oil to be used as fuel.

Mr. Ellis announced it was his intention to consult with the Secretaries of those Departments having an interest in the issue, namely, State, Defense, Treasury, Interior, Commerce, and Labor.

From this investigation came the report of February 13, 1963, which clearly

shows and recommends that "a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls would be consistent with national security and the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security."

What were some of the views expressed by the various Departments of the executive consulted by the OEP?

Defense Department: "As residual fuel oil production continues to decline in continental U.S. refineries, we feel that imports should make up the deficit which will have to be done in national emergencies * * * we cannot see where residual fuel oil imports can seriously endanger our national security."

Commerce Department: "The continuation of the residual oil quota plan as a method of increasing exploration, drilling, reserves for crude oil output appears rather tenuous."

Interior Department: "Relaxation of controls, would have some impact on the domestic producing industry—the extent would be difficult to ascertain in advance, it would almost be impossible, however, to isolate the moderate effects which might be anticipated from decontrol from normal changes in market conditions stemming from variations in the balance between demand and supply."

Justice Department: This important Department reported that controls of residual oil are detrimental to existing and future competition particularly in fuel oil marketing, and that numerous complaints of possible violation of the antitrust laws related to these controls had been received.

General Services Administration: This large Government consumer of both residual oil and coal, had this to say in the OEP report: "We believe that our experience in procurement of residual fuel under the oil import program has restricted full and free competition in our procurements and has resulted in this agency, in the main, paying prices in excess of that which would have been obtained, if there were no restrictions on the import of this product."

Office of Emergency Planning: The Director of the agency responsible for this reported. "I do not question the desirability of continuing measures to remedy hardship in the coal region. Of course, these measures could be continued. But I do not believe that the national security section of the Trade Expansion Act can under the showing of this investigation be the medium for Government assistance."

In short, the program of controls does not benefit the national security; is seriously questioned as a method of encouraging new oil exploration; would have not distinguishable impact on domestic producing if removed; is detrimental to competition and may be in violation of antitrust laws; has increased costs in Government procurement of fuel, and, most importantly, has artificially inflated fuel costs for millions of consumers and a substantial portion of the Nation's industrial community.

The OEP Director's comments clearly indicate that the legal basis for continuation of the program is nonexistent. On the whole, it cannot logically be denied that the OEP report shows the urgent need for abolishment of residual oil quotas and I respectfully request the President take immediate steps to implement the findings of this impartial study and to comply with the intent of the Trade Expansion Act in such matters.

The administration is attempting to save \$100 million in the construction costs of a new aircraft carrier by re-

verting to conventional rather than nuclear power, a move challenged as false economy by the experts. I submit that much more than this amount is at stake in the residual oil import question. The administration can demonstrate its concern for defense costs by removing—at the stroke of a pen—a costly program that can no longer be justified, if indeed it ever could, in the name of national security. The responsibility of the executive in this case is even greater than in matters that appear in a direct way in the defense budget, which are subject to careful examination of the Bureau of the Budget and the various committees of Congress.

The following article on residual oil and the editorial comment by Mr. La Motte, both appearing in the February 3, 1964, issue of the Oil and Gas Journal are both pertinent to this matter and should be of interest to Members of the House:

STILL THERE'S NO END IN SIGHT FOR RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT CONTROLS

(By Clyde La Motte)

One thing more difficult than getting something done in Washington is getting something undone.

A case in point: residual-fuel-oil import controls. No one really wants resid controls very much, except maybe the coal people. And they would be hard put to prove the resid program has enabled them to sell an extra scuttle of coal.

Still, the controls remain and probably will for a long time to come. This despite the current uproar as time for renewal of the program nears.

You will recall that resid controls were tacked onto the crude-oil-import-control program in 1959 almost incidentally. The major issue was the crude-oil situation, not resid.

In practice in the years since, crude-oil controls have gained widespread acceptance. There have been pressures for revisions, but no one seriously challenges the need for a control system.

Meanwhile, resid controls have continued to create irritation. In the first place, they don't control much of anything. Everyone knows that if a shortage of resid looms, Interior has to increase imports because domestic refiners want to make less resid, not more.

By contrast, domestic crude-oil producers would be all too happy to produce more crude if given the opportunity. Therein lies the big difference in the two programs.

About the only visible result of the resid control program, then, has been problems and friction.

Still, Interior contends that such controls need to be continued, even though most of its headaches stem from this source.

Producer groups are in the same boat. They fear that if resid controls were removed, this might cause a weakening in the crude-oil-import-control program. It would seem more logical to fear that unless resid controls are dumped, some of the complaints about the program will spill over to the crude program, endangering it. But the producers don't see it that way.

Either Interior or producers could win friends by advocating resid decontrol. But don't hold your breath.

"RESID"-CONTROL CRITICS STEP UP ATTACK

Longstanding discontent with the residual-fuel-oil import-control program is turning into a steady barrage of criticism as the time nears for Interior Department to make decisions on the program for the 12-month period beginning April 1.

All indications are that Interior wants to continue the program without substantial change, although perhaps with some adjustments in the system of quota allocation.

"The arguments we are hearing now are the same we've heard before," one Interior official commented last week.

The question now, however, is whether Interior can withstand the growing pressure for complete removal of resid controls or a major overhaul of the program.

The main attack is being made by east coast industrial consumers. They claim that the program is unnecessary, it is increasing the fuel costs without strengthening national security, and it smacks of end-use control.

The consumers are joined by independent terminal operators and residual-fuel sellers who complain they are tied to one supplier and are therefore at his mercy.

All three groups are working through their congressional delegations to bring pressure on the administration.

DEFENSE

Support for the program rests largely on coal producers, who say that "dumping" of cheap foreign residual fuel oil on the domestic market hurts the coal industry and increases unemployment of coal workers.

Domestic oil producers' organizations have given token support to the residual-fuel-oil program. They say an increase in imports would depress the domestic crude-oil market.

They also appear to feel that elimination of the residual-fuel-oil program, or a major relaxation of controls, might lead to attacks on the crude-oil-import-control system.

CONFLICT

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall has now been drawn directly into the debate through an exchange of letters between Industrial-States Congressmen and Interior.

Udall recently wrote to protesting Congressmen defending the program. His letter drew sharp replies from some of the recipients.

In his letter, Udall pointed out that a special Cabinet committee had recommended to President Eisenhower in 1959 that imports of crude oil and its derivatives, including residual, should be controlled in the interest of national security. This led to adoption of the mandatory control programs, one for crude oil and one for residual fuel oil.

Udall maintains that it was recognized from the outset that the control programs would increase fuel costs for U.S. consumers, at least on a short-term basis.

But, without controls, he says, the cost might be even greater in the long run.

"The moderate immediate additional costs attributable to the program are necessary to the maintenance of an industry that is perhaps the most essential of all to our national security," Udall said in a recent letter to Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire.

The Secretary argued that it is necessary to keep all oil products, as well as crude, under control if the overall program is to succeed. Removal of even one product, such as residual fuel oil, "would lead to piecemeal dismemberment of a program which is almost universally recognized as being essential to the national interest."

The Secretary pointed out that the department has liberalized the residual-fuel regulations during the past 3 years to include terminal operators and others who had not qualified under the original historical importer provision.

REBUTTAL

CLEVELAND and others were not mollified by Udall's explanations.

The Congressman last week fired back a letter challenging every major point raised by Udall.

He charged that Udall was guilty of adding

apples and oranges in linking crude oil and residual fuel oil. They are two entirely different situations, CLEVELAND said.

He challenged Udall's reference to the need for "a healthy domestic industry capable of exploring for and developing petroleum reserves essential to the national security."

That, said CLEVELAND, obviously refers to crude oil and has no place in a discussion of residual fuel oil because producers obviously aren't exploring for residual fuel oil.

CLEVELAND also mentioned the interdepartmental study headed by the Office of Emergency Planning which last year called for a "meaningful relaxation" in residual-import controls.

"That report," CLEVELAND said, "effectively exploded any fictitious arguments that national security was being imperiled by residual-fuel-oil imports."

OTHER ASPECTS

The controversy is 'bubbling up at other points.

For one, the Justice Department says it is looking into possible antitrust violations stemming from the control program.

William H. Orrick, assistant attorney general, revealed this in a recent letter to John K. Evans, Washington representative for the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, Inc.

Justice has no jurisdiction over administration of oil-import controls, Orrick wrote, but "it is deeply concerned with the possible effects of that control system on free enterprise competition in oil marketing."

Orrick's letter was in response to one written him by Evans.

Pressure is also being brought to bear by residual-fuel-oil sellers who have no storage capacity. They want their own quotas, contending they are now at the mercy of suppliers who can require tie-in sales or make other demands.

POLITICS

The present attack on the residual program may be more intensified than in the past because of the political change.

Political analysts speculate that the Johnson administration is more likely to woo the industrial East for political support. The late President Kennedy, by contrast, was said to feel some obligation to the coal States, particularly West Virginia.

President Johnson's announcement that Interior would be responsible for oil policy at least gave critics and politicians a single target on which to concentrate.

And they are doing considerable concentrating.

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. BALDWIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. WIDNALL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. BALDWIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. WIDNALL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

OUR "ALLIES" AND CUBA

(Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. BALDWIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2763

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most Americans have been closely following the developments in the Guantanamo Naval Base crisis, which should more properly be called the latest development in the continuing Cuban crisis.

Therefore, I will not background my remarks with specific quotations from the press, since the major developments are common knowledge. They are:

First. That the Castro regime cut off the Guantanamo Naval Base water supply.

Second. The United States plans to supply its own water.

Third. The United States is putting renewed pressure on its NATO Allies to stop trading with Cuba. This especially applies to Great Britain and France, who are to sell a total of \$21 million worth of vehicles to Cuba.

Fourth. Great Britain and France counter, according to the press, by citing our wheat sales to the Soviet Union.

Fifth. The United States says that the sale of wheat to the Russians is not the same thing as sale of motor vehicles of various types to Cuba.

Let us, for the sake of brevity, pass over the embarrassment the United States must suffer propagandawise as the result of Castro's inane gesture of defiance. Let us consider the broader problem—the increasing disarray of the NATO Alliance, caused by just such incidents as these.

I am not convinced that the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union is any different than the sale of busses or trucks to Cuba by our allies. The evidence still shows that communism is an international movement, fundamentally directed from a central location, though it might deviate slightly due to local conditions.

But even if we were to grant—which we do not—that the sale of wheat to the Soviets is different than trade with Cuba, as the Johnson administration contends, our allies must still wonder about some of our other sales to the Sino-Soviet bloc.

They include, for the years 1961 and 1962: \$2,431,000 worth of iron and steel mill products; \$1,482,000 worth of crude sulfur; \$2,283,000 worth of aluminum ores and concentrates; \$2,202,000 worth of electrical machinery and apparatus; \$3,594,000 worth of construction and excavating machinery; \$4,514,000 worth of metalworking machinery and parts; \$2,927,000 worth of what the Department of Commerce classifies as "other industrial machinery"; \$1,141,000 worth of chemical specialties; \$1,629,000 worth of industrial chemicals; and \$874,000 worth of scientific and professional instruments, apparatus and supplies. All of these statistics are from a report issued by the U.S. Foreign Trade Statistics, Department of Commerce.

I have not cited other exports to the Sino-Soviet bloc for that period of time, which are basically food, fiber, and synthetic products, such as \$5,390,000 worth of synthetic rubber. Total U.S. exports to the Sino-Soviet bloc in 1961 and 1962 were \$258,471,000. In 1961, the total was \$133,331,000. In 1962, it fell slightly to \$125,140.

In 1963, according to statistics of the International Trade Analysis Division of the U.S. Department of Commerce, total exports from the United States to the Soviet bloc had risen to \$140,400,000 from January through November, with the December figure not yet available.

The argument is being advanced that our allies should not trade with Cuba because Cuba is on the doorstep of the United States. From January through November 1963, we exported \$4,100,000 worth of goods to East Germany, which is on West Germany's doorstep. In fact, the Soviet satellites in Europe might all be classified as on the doorsteps of our NATO allies. But we exported \$100,000,000 worth of goods to Poland; \$18,400,000 worth to the Soviet Union; \$7.9 million worth to Czechoslovakia; \$5,900,000 worth to Hungary and lesser amounts to the other European satellites, in the first 11 months of 1963.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that these are impressive exports to a bloc of nations whose leaders have individually and collectively expressed themselves as our enemies. Meanwhile, our general imports from the Sino-Soviet bloc, were also sizable. General imports from these nations were \$84,041,000 in 1961; \$82,380,000 in 1962 and \$78,400,000 from January through November 1963.

Our exports to the Sino-Soviet bloc for just a month less than 3 years, do not show our recent sales of wheat, which are expected to reach \$250 million alone. And, in the wake of the wheat deal, there are smaller ones, such as the sale of corn to Hungary. We appear to be loosening our trade policy toward the Communist camp generally.

It is small wonder that our allies see no wrong in trading with Castro's Cuba. Cuba is Communist. So is East Germany. It just happens that Cuba is on our doorstep and that East Germany and her neighboring Communist states are on the doorsteps of our allies. We trade with the European Communists. Our European allies trade with the American Communists.

On September 30, 1963, on the floor of the House, speaking on trade with the Soviet Union, I asked this question:

"Would our expanded entry into trade with the Soviet Union tend to weaken or strengthen our position with our allies and their in relation to the Soviet bloc?" This is a question which is being answered.

There are two paths of leadership which the United States can assume within the NATO alliance.

We can, first, attempt to intimidate our allies into compliance with our policies, or second, we can seek cooperation between the member nations for the best interests of all.

On October 4, 1963, the House Republican task force on NATO unity, of which I am chairman, sent to the President a statement asking for a top-level meeting of NATO nations to discuss a joint trade policy under article II of the NATO Treaty. On November 17, such a meeting was held in Paris, apparently without tangible results. Now, as another

irritant in the Cuban situation, we are at odds with our NATO allies over sales to Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I again respectfully suggest that the Johnson administration take the necessary steps to put our own house in order. Wheat is not our only sale. We have sold machinery, synthetics, chemicals.

Stewart Alsop, writing in the Saturday Evening Post, observes that:

Now, Khrushchev's big, simple solution is chemical production. It is estimated that the Soviet Union is to invest \$40 billion in chemical plants which will produce plastics and synthetics for industry and heavy doses of chemical fertilizers to feed the starved Russian land.

Could our machines, chemicals, synthetics of 1961 and 1962 have served in testing centers behind the Iron Curtain?

When we put our house in order and present a consistent approach in regard to Communist trade, we may have the opportunity to develop a joint trade policy with our allies, recognizing that trade is an economic weapon in the cold war.

(Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. BALDWIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. QUIE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. BALDWIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. QUIE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. BALDWIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. QUIE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. BALDWIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. QUIE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S EFFORTS TO TRIM GOVERNMENT EXPENSES

(Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. BALDWIN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the President's efforts to trim Government expenses, personnel, and waste received a generous boost this week from the Raytheon Co., of Lexington, Mass. The firm has graciously agreed to provide the Government with the details of its reducing

plan designed to cut costs and increase efficiency. Within the next few weeks, the Lexington firm will hold extensive conferences with Budget Bureau officials and outline the specifics of Raytheon's plan which has already been extremely successful at the firm's plants.

This program should be of interest to all of us interested in helping the Federal Government to do its job better. Under unanimous consent, I am inserting an article describing the plan which appeared in the Boston Globe on February 10 by Wilfred C. Rodgers, the Globe's Washington correspondent:

COMPUTERS WILL HELP UNITED STATES TO "LOSE WEIGHT"

(By Wilfred C. Rodgers)

WASHINGTON.—Like everyone that has grown fat, the Federal Government is trying to reduce.

Instead of scales, the Government will be watching computers to try and trim the fat off its growing labor costs.

The Government got the reducing plan from a Bay State firm, Raytheon, Inc., of Lexington, Mass.

Raytheon claims dramatic results, slimming its work force down some 36 percent. And its plans is in effect in only 4 of its 20 plants.

Budget Bureau officials say they heard about Raytheon's reducing plan from the Navy Department. They investigated.

Raytheon agreed to permit the Government to use the plan without cost.

According to Raytheon, one of the Bay State's biggest employers with its far-flung network of plants, there are six major enemies to be fought to bring down manpower costs.

These enemies are excessive supervision, work duplication, overspecialization, fragmentation of routine work, staffing for peaks, and lack of supervision.

James Hendrick, of Raytheon, one of the fathers of the plan, will help key in top Government bosses on how the plan operates.

Hendrick, who lives in Lincoln, Mass., claims that any firm that employs more than 1,000 persons is prone to attack from these enemies.

To root out excessive supervision, Raytheon put together a chart book that "keeps the existing structure in focus when organization changes are being considered."

This chart book aims at eliminating empire building—which most industries as well as the Federal Government feel they have too much of.

In addition a new business dictionary is composed. It defines exactly workers' jobs, not just what the job's classification plan says the job is.

Computers are brought onto the firing line to X-ray total payroll costs in such a manner as to identify cost abnormalities and dig out misplaced functions.

In addition a manpower value analysis is made to determine which jobs are "affordable," and which are just "nice to have."

Raytheon developed what it calls a "work pulse analyzer" to identify situations where management is paying a premium for work-and-wait practices.

It earmarks the cause-and-effect aspects of overstaffing and points out opportunities for reducing payroll costs.

And to get better supervision, Raytheon sets up a "boot camp" for its supervisors.

These supervisors learn to organize, deputize, supervise, and energize their work forces.

Hendrick claims that proper scheduling of work alone can be one of the most effective weapons in bringing down manpower costs.

Although not paid any money, Raytheon was paid a compliment by the acceptance of its plan by the Government.

Not too long ago most big Government contractors such as Raytheon came under attack from the Government for "excessive costs."

The Navy Department, which recommended the Raytheon plan, apparently has become convinced Raytheon's plan is one way to defeat this problem.

Next Monday the Bureau of the Budget will set up a weeklong conference for Raytheon staff members to explain the reducing plan to top Government agency heads.

Budget Bureau officials claim that jobs that are eliminated by the plan won't necessarily mean mass firings.

They point out that attrition such as deaths and retirements will take care of many such jobs and that other workers can be transferred to new departments or agencies instead of those agencies or departments having to hire new help.

And if it is any consolation to Government workers, the plan apparently doesn't intend to wipe out the coffee break.

Next week's conference includes a liberal amount of coffee breaks for the bosses.

THE EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING

(MR. CLEVELAND (at the request of MR. BALDWIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matters.)

MR. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the oldest organization of its kind in the United States devoted to person-to-person exchange between our country and lands abroad is the Experiment in International Living, Putney, Vt. Participants from this country live in the actual homes of foreign countries while foreign students live in our homes. The Experiment has proved that significant advances toward world understanding can be made at the personal level and that people can learn "to live together by living together."

EFFECTIVE PATH TO INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

At a time when America's foreign aid programs are being sharply criticized, even by those abroad presumed to be benefiting from them, it is reassuring to know that the quiet, unspectacular and often unheralded efforts of some of our private organizations are building good will, amity, and better understanding throughout the four corners of the globe. The Experiment is a voluntary organization which relies not on Federal subsidies for its existence but on foundation grants, contributions from individuals, and fees from participants. The sharp contrast between the success of an organization such as the Experiment largely based on individual voluntary efforts and some of the recent failures in friendship from countries receiving staggering amounts of foreign aid, points out a vital lesson. International education and understanding cannot be bought, but person-to-person contact such as that promoted by the Experiment can make great progress. Their efforts deserve wider attention and broader support from all of us.

The Experiment has many friends in public life. Our beloved colleague,

FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, has been an enthusiastic supporter of the Experiment in International Living and is president of the Payne Fund, whose 1931 grant stimulated the founding of the Experiment and which made it possible in 1962 to purchase Sandanona, its international training and orientation center near Brattleboro, Vt. The wife of Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, experimented to Germany in 1935 and to England in 1939, and their son experimented to Germany in 1960. The daughter of Representative WILLIAM SPRINGER, of Illinois, experimented to Germany in 1960, and the Springer family was a host family to an incoming experimenter in 1962. The daughter of Representative CHARLES TEAGUE, of California, experimented to Chile in 1960. Senator GEORGE Aiken, of Vermont, is a Putney neighbor and longtime supporter of the Experiment. Robert Stafford, former Governor of Vermont, is also a loyal friend of this endeavor. Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, has commended the Experiment "on the fine work it is doing."

Dr. F. Gordon Boyce, a fellow trustee of Colgate University and a neighbor of mine in Vermont who is president of the Experiment in International Living, visited me recently in Washington. He had come for consultation with the Peace Corps, for which the experiment has trained more units than any other private voluntary agency, and to discuss with his alumni the need for more scholarship assistance. Gone is the skepticism which characterized the founding of the Experiment in 1932 as a "visionary philosophy." From my meeting with Dr. Boyce I learned something of the astonishing growth of the international exchange of persons and especially of the experiment within the past 5 years.

The Experiment's combined outbound and incoming programs in 1958 totaled 1,400 young men and women. Last year there were more than 4,000. Obviously, more and more individuals, colleges, universities, and Government agencies are turning to the experiment. The ingredients of the experiment method are careful selection of participants and leaders, comprehensive orientation, leadership, the homestay, and the evaluation. Many colleges and universities grant academic credit for participation in the experiment.

The various departments in the Experiment are managed by 20 staff heads and associates—the senior and ranking members of the administration who select and train field group leaders. Each outbound unit of the Experiment is under guidance of a highly qualified, carefully selected, and thoroughly trained individual. These leaders act as a field faculty and are paid. They come largely from the educational field and must meet stringent requirements including fluency in a foreign language and familiarity with the countries involved. Each leader undergoes a training period at the Experiment's training and orientation center, or at other selected sites in the Midwest and Far West.